



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

**Non-Precedent Decision of the
Administrative Appeals Office**

In Re: 31205065

Date: JULY 2, 2024

Appeal of Texas Service Center Decision

Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Workers (Extraordinary Ability)

The Petitioner seeks classification as an individual of extraordinary ability in the arts. *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 203(b)(1)(A), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A). This first preference classification makes immigrant visas available to those who can demonstrate their extraordinary ability through sustained national or international acclaim and whose achievements have been recognized in their field through extensive documentation.

The Director of the Texas Service Center denied the petition, concluding the Petitioner did not establish he satisfied at least three of the initial evidentiary criteria. The matter is now before us on appeal pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3.

The Petitioner bears the burden of proof to demonstrate eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375-76 (AAO 2010). We review the questions in this matter de novo. *Matter of Christo's, Inc.*, 26 I&N Dec. 537, 537 n.2 (AAO 2015). Upon de novo review, we will withdraw the Director's decision and remand the matter for entry of a new decision consistent with the following analysis.

Section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act makes immigrant visas available to individuals with extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics which has been demonstrated by sustained national or international acclaim and whose achievements have been recognized in the field through extensive documentation, provided that the individual seeks to enter the United States to continue work in the area of extraordinary ability, and the individual's entry into the United States will substantially benefit prospectively the United States.

The term "extraordinary ability" refers only to those individuals in "that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the field of endeavor." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2). The implementing regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3) sets forth a multi-part analysis. First, a petitioner can demonstrate sustained acclaim and the recognition of achievements in the field through a one-time achievement (that is, a major, internationally recognized award) or qualifying documentation that meets at least three of the ten categories listed at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i) – (x) (including items such as awards, published material in certain media, and scholarly articles).

Where a petitioner meets these initial evidence requirements, we then consider the totality of the material provided in a final merits determination and assess whether the record shows sustained national or international acclaim and demonstrates that the individual is among the small percentage at the very top of the field of endeavor. *See Kazarian v. USCIS*, 596 F.3d 1115 (9th Cir. 2010) (discussing a two-part review where the documentation is first counted and then, if fulfilling the required number of criteria, considered in the context of a final merits determination); *see also Visinscaia v. Beers*, 4 F. Supp. 3d 126, 131-32 (D.D.C. 2013); *Rijal v. USCIS*, 772 F. Supp. 2d 1339 (W.D. Wash. 2011).

Because the Petitioner has not indicated or established receipt of a major, internationally recognized award, he must satisfy at least three of the alternate regulatory criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i)-(x). The Petitioner claimed to have satisfied six of these criteria, but the Director determined the Petitioner fulfilled only two: published material at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iii) and judging the work of others at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iv). On appeal, the Petitioner maintains that he meets four additional criteria, relating to awards, original contributions, display, and critical role.

Upon review of the record, we agree with the Petitioner that he satisfies the display criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(vii).¹ The Petitioner has therefore overcome the basis for denial of the petition through fulfillment of three regulatory criteria. Nevertheless, granting the third initial criterion does not suffice to establish eligibility for classification as an individual of extraordinary ability. The Director must undertake a final merits determination to analyze the Petitioner's accomplishments and weigh the totality of the evidence to determine if they establish that he has sustained national or international acclaim in the field and that he is one of the small percentage who has risen to the very top of the field of endeavor. *See* section 203(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2), (3); *see also Kazarian*, 596 F.3d at 1119-20.

Because the Petitioner has overcome the stated reason for denial, we remand this proceeding so that the Director can render a final merits determination.

ORDER: The Director's decision is withdrawn. The matter is remanded for the entry of a new decision consistent with the foregoing analysis.

¹ For example, the record includes documentation indicating the Petitioner has displayed his work at artistic exhibitions at the [] and the [].